

**The Catholic Record.**

Published Weekly at 481 and 185 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, MESSRS. LEKE, KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVEN and M. C. O'DONNELL are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, agents measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of London, Hamilton and Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning. Arrears must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, Feb. 13, 1892.

**ENEMIES OF THE CROSS OF CHRIST.**

Hatred of the Cross is one of the characteristics of those among the Protestants who delight in calling themselves Evangelicals, though nothing is more unevangelical than such a hatred. Even before the crucifixion the cross was made by our Lord the symbol of the Christian's life of penance, as when He said: "he that taketh not up his cross and followeth Me is not worthy of Me." (St. Matt. x. 38.) After the death of Christ became the special emblem of the Christian's hope, and of our Redemption, so that St. Paul declared that he preached the Gospel, "not in wisdom of speech, lest the cross of Christ should be made void, for the word of the cross to them indeed that perish is foolishness, but to them that are saved, that is to us, it is the power of God." "By the cross," the same Apostle says when writing to the Galatians, "we are reconciled to God in one body;" and he prays that he may not glory in anything "save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Cor. i. 17; Gal. vi. 14, 16.) He speaks with great commiseration and regret of those who are "enemies of the cross of Christ," weeping for them. (Phil. iii, 19.)

The Church of England does not, as a Church, repudiate the cross or disrespect it. In the form of administering baptism, the use of the sign of the cross is prescribed as one of the ceremonies, and on Anglican churches the cross is regularly placed, high on the steeple, as a sign that they are Christian edifices. But we frequently find that Anglican congregations rebel against this practice, and tear down such crosses when they have been erected. They are truly "enemies of the cross of Christ," such as those whom St. Paul describes. We have even known of the case where an Anglican Bishop in Canada partook of this same hatred of the cross, and refused to administer confirmation in a parish where a cross was visible among other decorations of the church which were prepared purposely to give him a cordial welcome on the occasion of his visitation to the parish. We believe that this hatred of the cross was carried so far, that during his life no clergyman of his diocese dared to show any respect for the cross, though we know that it was frequently their wish to do so, that they might be in harmony with the spirit of Christianity of past ages ever since the days of the Apostles.

A recent manifestation of hatred of the cross occurred in Newry, Ireland, when the rector, who did not share this hatred, desired to have the cross placed in a prominent position in the church to remind his parishioners that, by the blood of Christ suffering on the cross, we are saved. What could be more appropriate for this purpose than the depicting of a cross on the communion linen? When instituting the Eucharist, and commanding the Apostles to celebrate it, Christ told them: "For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice: you shall show the death of the Lord until he come." (1 Cor. xi., 24.) It is, therefore, desirable that a Christian should frequently recall to mind the death of Christ, and especially so in the administration of the Eucharist. It was most appropriate that there should be something recalling the death of Christ in the communion ornaments of the church, and with this object the rector had the cross made on the communion cloth, together with the letters I. H. S., meaning "Jesus the Saviour of men."

But the congregation, or rather the major part of the congregation, are cross-haters, and eleven vestrymen solemnly formed a column for attack, marched in procession from the vestibule of the church while service was going on, seized the portion of the communion cloth which had on it the cross and lettering, and tore it into shreds, in spite of the efforts of the rector to save it from their hands. When they had done this they burned

the offensive cloth within the church, and comportedly took their seats to join in the Church service as if they had just performed a most heroic and Christian act.

Newry claims to be an extremely "Evangelical" locality. The Protestants there settled have received their religious traditions from ancestors who emigrated from Scotland, and were planted there under Oliver Cromwell. Their traditions are, therefore, thoroughly Knoxonian and Calvinistic. John Knox was a thorough hater of the cross, and so was John Calvin. But the Christian Church in all ages venerated it to such a degree that Tertullian, who wrote in the second century, said:

"On all occasions, whether we enter or go forth from our houses, when we put on our clothing, or our shoes, or retire to bed, when we sit, indeed whatsoever we do, we mark on our foreheads the sign of the cross."

The learned Origen gives as the reason for this pious and constant usage:

"The devil's fear and tremble when they see upon you the sign of the cross faithfully fixed."

St. Cyril said: "Be not ashamed of the cross of Christ. But if any one hide it, sign yourself with the cross, openly on your forehead." In another place he adds:

"Make this sign (of the cross) when you eat or drink, sit or stand, talk or walk, and, in a word, whenever you engage in any business."

These testimonies are sufficient to show the respect which true Christians have always manifested for this sacred sign. But the Newry Protestants with their Calvinistic traditions have never been able to endure the sight of a cross. They resemble in this respect the so-called evangelicals of Canada. Some time ago another event happened in the neighborhood of Newry which further illustrated their sentiments on this subject. A cross was erected over the grave of a member of a respectable Anglican family, to indicate that the deceased had died a Christian, but the Churchwardens and other members of the congregation gathered shortly afterwards in a mob at the grave, and with every manifestation of hatred and spleen completely demolished with stones the emblem of salvation. Surely St. Paul had just these Evangelicals in view when he wept over the infatuation and blasphemies of those who were "enemies of the cross of Christ!"

It will be remembered by our readers that when the Anglican Bishop of London erected a cross recently in St. Paul's church, London, he was subjected to a prosecution by the Evangelical Alliance of the city, in the hope that the use of crosses in churches would be declared illegal. The Court, however, sustained the Bishop. It was not understood by this decision that the Bishop was to be commended for using the cross, but only that he could not be interfered with as long as he used it in churches within his own jurisdiction. The Anglican Church may, therefore, within certain limits, make use of the sign of the cross; but it is certainly responsible for the hatred of the cross which it engendered and fostered by destroying crosses on the Catholic churches when their property was confiscated to the use of the law-made Church of England. It is not surprising that those who love the cross of Christ, and glory in it, like St. Paul, should leave a church which can tolerate such hatred for the cross of Christ as is manifested by the Evangelicals of Newry and London city.

**BWARE OF LOTTERY FRAUDS.**

A circular sent to us by Mr. F. L. Stoffle, of 1201 Clyburn avenue, Chicago, calls our attention to a feature of the lottery craze to which public attention has not hitherto been particularly directed, but which ought to be duly weighed when we take account of the magnitude of the lottery evil.

Mr. Stoffle states that he purchased a ticket from E. Fox & Co., of Kansas City, purporting to be a genuine "Louisiana State Lottery ticket." The ticket was not signed with the usual name of Paul Conrad, which is found on the real Louisiana tickets, and of course it turned out to be a forgery.

The forgery was not detected until the purchaser found that his number had drawn the "capital prize" of \$15,000; but on his forwarding the ticket to Messrs. E. Fox & Co. to get the money, it was returned to him "unhonored and unpaid;" and the only benefit Mr. Stoffle derived from the transaction was that he paid \$30 in express charges in forwarding and receiving back his ticket. He adds:

"I am well informed and verily

believe beyond a doubt that said E. Fox & Co. have no money to pay prizes and that they receive money under false pretences; and that there is no such Company in existence as E. Fox & Co. operating a lottery."

We have on several occasions placed before our readers valid reasons why they should not invest their money in the purchase of lottery tickets which hold out a prospect of great gain for the expenditure of a small sum of money and we gave our readers some insight into the operations of the "Louisiana State Lottery," which we look upon as one of the biggest frauds of the day.

This lottery is still doing a thriving business notwithstanding that its fraudulent workings have been frequently exposed, and that the whole power of the United States Government is arrayed against it. The difficulty with which the Government of the United States has to contend is that matters of this kind belong not to the Federal Government to control, but to the State Legislatures. In consequence of this, it remains with the Legislature of Louisiana to decide whether the lottery shall continue to exist after the expiration of its present charter in 1893.

The Federal Government can only control the mails, but it hampered very much this and other Lottery Companies when Congress passed a law prohibiting the use of the mails for the transmission of lottery tickets. But the Louisiana Company was not thus to be baffled, and after several unsuccessful efforts to evade the stringent laws which were directed against it, it has given up this point of using the mails and it now employs the agency of the Express Companies for carrying on its business.

This business is so extensive through the United States and Canada that the 60 per cent. which we understand the Company takes as its profits out of the ticket money attains annually the enormous sum of about \$18,500,000; and this is what the dupes or ticket buyers contribute toward the enrichment of shareholders, while their own chance of getting a prize is exceedingly small. It needs no demonstration to prove that those who invest in such a chance are extremely foolish, and if the investment be considerable they do great injury to their own prospects and to their families which have the first claim upon their earnings; and we regret to have it to say that there are many young men in Canada who regularly every month contribute in this way to the fraud.

The Louisiana Legislature is at this moment being strongly tempted to extend the charter of the Company, for the reason that while that State contributes but a small percentage of the receipts of the Lottery, the Company are willing to purchase a renewal of the charter by the payment of a very liberal bribe to the State Treasury. Having so many dupes they can easily do this.

According to the official reports, only 3 per cent. of the tickets are sold in Louisiana itself, the remaining 97 per cent. being sold throughout the United States and Canada. Hence it will be a great financial benefit to Louisiana to receive from the Company the annual sum of a million and a quarter dollars for State purposes, this being the amount offered by the Company as a bribe. It is proposed to spend this money as follows: for schools, \$350,000; for levees on the Mississippi, \$850,000; for charities, \$150,000; for pensions to Confederate veterans, \$50,000; for sewage for New Orleans, \$100,000; for the general fund of the State \$250,000.

We have nothing to say against the lawfulness of these objects in themselves, but we unhesitatingly tell our readers that they ought not to submit to be blackmailed for the benefit of the State of Louisiana, even if the whole profit on the tickets they purchase went to the State. But as a matter of fact, even this large sum represents only four or five cents on every dollar which is spent in the purchase of tickets. The chief part of the money goes towards enriching the company which manage the enterprise; and even if the whole drawing were managed with the most perfect fairness, the mathematically estimated value of the expectation of a ticket holder who spend \$10 in the purchase of tickets would be only about \$3.33, since this is asserted to be the proportion of receipts spent in prizes. A few ticket holders may be enriched by a lucky chance, but thousands must necessarily lose all they invest to bring about this result; and when the monthly sums thus foolishly spent are large, many will necessarily be ruined

by their love of gambling in this losing game.

But Mr. Stoffle's experience, of which we spoke in the beginning of this article, shows that there is an additional danger hitherto unexpected to which the lottery gamblers are exposed—the danger that, after all their expenditure, they may have wasted their money on forged tickets which cannot by any possibility win a prize, but will, on the contrary, entail on the purchasers a heavy expense, if the tickets bought should happen to be the lucky numbers. The truth seems to be that those who buy these lottery tickets will never know whether their tickets are bogus or not, until, like Mr. Stoffle, they win a prize, and then find out that there is no prize for them.

**THE CHURCH IN FRANCE.**

Ever since the establishment of the French Republic in 1870, it seems to have been the object of the rulers of France to hamper and annoy the Church, and, if possible, to destroy its influence with the people. There were times, however, when the rulers seemed to be conscious that they had outraged the Catholic feelings of the people beyond what their usual apathy would endure, and for certain short periods there has been a lull in the persecution of religion.

The latest cable despatches received show an almost inexplicable series of occurrences in regard to the relations of the Republic with the Pope and the Church which it is difficult to reconcile with each other. Thus it is stated that negotiations have been going on between the French Ambassador at the Vatican, the Count de Behaine, and the Holy See, by which a greater cordiality has been established than has hitherto existed between the Government and the Pope, and it is certain that the Pope has written to the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris requiring him to archbishop the clergy to acquiesce in the Republican form of Government, and to abstain from partizanship with any of the monarchial factions which are aiming at the overthrow of the Republic.

We are also informed that on New Year's day the congratulations sent by President Carnot to the Holy Father were very cordial, and that the Pope's reply was equally friendly, expressing the best wishes for the prosperity and peace of the Republic.

A few days later the news came that the Archbishop of Paris and four other Archbishops joined in issuing a protest against the anti-religious and atheistic policy of the Government; and these are the facts which it is difficult to reconcile.

The Archbishops of Toulouse, Rheims, St. Malo and Lyons are those who have brought this impeachment against the Government. They protest against the encouragement given to priests to violate their sacred vows, the cutting down of ecclesiastical subsidies, the persecution of religious orders by expropriation and taxation, the compulsory military service of seminarists, divorce, the subjection of religious worship to the control of the municipal authorities, and the banishment of religion from schools and charitable institutions. They call upon the people to respect the laws, as long as they do not violate the rights of conscience, but exhort them to resist the encroachments of the civil power on the domain of religion. They tell the people that it is by a faithful discharge of their electoral duties that they will remedy these grievances, and admonish them to apply this remedy.

The devotedness of Cardinal Richard to the Holy See is well known, and it cannot for a moment be imagined that he has inaugurated any movement contrary to the expressed wish of the Pope. We may therefore reasonably infer that the Pope's letter by no means approves of the general policy of the present Government, and that it does not ask the clergy to adhere unreservedly to that policy. It is also evident that the five Archbishops do not so interpret it. We may, therefore, safely conclude that the Holy Father believes that the French people have sufficiently manifested their will that their Government should be a Republic, and that he wishes the clergy to accept unreservedly this manifestation of the wish of the people, and to have nothing to do with the parties which are laboring for the restoration of any of the effete dynasties which have governed France in the past. This view of the case, however, does not oblige them to accept either the men who compose the present administration or the policy they think it proper to adopt. Whether it be in France or elsewhere, the clergy will not cede their right to

be a factor in shaping the policy and influencing the destinies of their country, and certainly, even while they support the Republic, their influence in France will be directed towards placing a truly Christian administration in power; and sooner or later they will succeed.

In regard to the greater excellence of a Monarchical or a Republican form of government, there is room for a difference of opinion. The Church as the depositary of divine revelation has no special preference on the subject, and it is perfectly lawful for clergy and laity alike to have their own views. But the voice of the country has been heard on the subject, and it is unmistakably in favor of a Republic. It is full time for men of prudence to accept the decision notwithstanding that their individual preferences may lie in another direction. For this reason the advice of the Pope given to Cardinal Lavigerie to use his influence in favor of the Republic is the dictate of wisdom; but this does not, nor is it intended, to bind the clergy to accept tamely the anti-Catholic legislation which has emanated from the successive administrations which have ruled since the establishment of the Republic; and we have no doubt that the protest of the five Archbishops will have due weight in influencing the course of the government of President Carnot, or at least of the next President, should it not prevail during the present regime.

That the Pope takes this view of the matter also is abundantly proved by the honors which he recently bestowed upon the Archbishop of Aix, Monseigneur Goutte-Soulard, to console him for the persecution to which he was subjected by the Government for asserting his liberties as a French citizen, and as a Bishop of the Church, who is not to be subjected to Governmental interference in the administration of the affairs of his diocese. By sheer force the Government may for the present moment prevail, but its outrages against the Catholic conscience of the people will be remembered, and the time must soon come when popular indignation will replace the Acheists with men of Catholic instincts and antecedents.

**A NEW PRESENTATION OF AN OLD DOCTRINE.**

The Presbyterian agitation over the subject of revision of the Confession of Faith has reached the stage that the committee appointed to prepare a report on the changes which ought to be made have agreed upon what they will recommend to the next meeting of the General Assembly which is to take place in June, but it may safely be said that the conclusions reached will scarcely satisfy the longings of the pro-Revision party, while they will stir up the bile of the anti-Revisionists to no small degree.

In regard to the need of revision, we have never hesitated in expressing the opinion that the Westminster Confession is badly in need of it, and such is evidently the opinion of the majority of Presbyterians, otherwise the demand for it would not have been so loudly made by a decisive majority of Presbyteries throughout the continent of America.

Presbyterianism being a form of Calvinism, the doctrines of John Calvin on predestination and preterition were regarded as the distinctive doctrine of all who should claim to call themselves Presbyterians. This doctrine is declared in the Westminster Confession in the following terms:

"By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life and others foreordained to everlasting death." (Chap. 3.)

Of those who are destined to perdition, the same chapter speaks as follows:

"The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice."

The manner in which this glorious justice operates is described in the same chapter, wherein it is said that "God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass."

It is here added, indeed, that "Thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established."

But since sin, equally with acts of virtue, is "freely and unchangeably ordained" by God, it is clear that according to this doctrine God is made

the efficient cause and author of sin, and human liberty is taken away, in spite of the gloss by means of which an attempt is made to modify the force of the former words.

It has been in the past the boast of Presbyterians that in this teaching they are pure Calvinists; and in the resolution which was finally passed in the American General Assembly, when it was resolved to appoint a Revision Committee, the Committee were instructed not to change the Calvinism of the Confession. From all this it is to be inferred that their intention and the intention of the framers of the Westminster Confession was to teach the doctrine of Calvin on this subject. We may therefore very properly look to the teachings of Calvin to learn what is meant by the Presbyterian doctrines of predestination and preterition.

Calvin says that the wicked or reprobate "cannot move their finger, except by His (God's) permission, nor, indeed, except by His command." (Institutions I, chap. 17.)

Elsewhere (chap. 18) he says:

"Whereas God wishes and ordains that man be blinded, and will afterwards be punished for his blindness, it appears absurd to make the subterfuge that God only permits and does not will that this be so, whereas He Himself repudiates this subterfuge, declaring plainly that He does the act. For it is proved by innumerable and clear testimonies that men do nothing, unless by the hidden will of God, and that they effect nothing deliberately except what He has decreed, and ordained by His inscrutable appointment."

In the same chapter we read: "By the just impulse of God, man does what it is unlawful for him to do."

Over and over again Calvin repeats this in his doctrinal works, and his followers say the same thing, among whom Theodore Beza is especially clear.

Notwithstanding the pretense of the Westminster Confession, that God is not the author of evil, it is therefore clear that, according to Presbyterian doctrine, He is really its author. The absurd explanation of Beza is to the effect that in God the act is good, whereas in His instrument, man, it is evil.

The revisers appointed by the General Assembly propose to substitute for the words of the Westminster Confession as above quoted, a new chapter which retains the same doctrine as before, but which adds a commentary which is intended to make it appear somewhat more reasonable. This gilding of the pill will scarcely satisfy those who have so earnestly demanded revision, as it was their wish that this doctrine above all should be modified. It is, however, worthy of remark that the revisers were more anxious to make a chapter which would be agreeable to the majority than to make one which would set forth the truth as revealed by God.

The new chapter is as follows:

"The rest of mankind, God saw fit according to the unsearchable counsel of His will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, not to elect unto eternal life, and then wrath for their sins, to the praise of His glorious justice. Yet hath He no pleasure in the death of the wicked, nor is it His decree, but the wickedness of their own hearts which restraineth and hindereth them from accepting the offer of His grace made in the Gospel."

How different from this is the Catholic doctrine, as it is set forth by Pope St. Leo, who defined:

"Not only do we not believe that any are foreordained to evil by the power of God, but we detest and anathematize all who believe this great evil."

It is this horrible doctrine which makes God the cause of evil, which has been the occasion why so many Presbyterians have become declared Infidels like Bob Ingersoll, and so many others have practically given up Christianity by becoming Universalists and Unitarians. They very justly reason that God, who is just, will not punish forever those of whose sins He has Himself been the real cause.

It is true that God knew when He created our first parents that they would fall into sin, and some imagine on this account that sin must be attributed to Him as its author; but it is quite a different thing to know of sin, and to be the cause of it. God created man free, in order that being able to choose between good and evil, he might choose the good and merit a greater reward as they do who avoid evil. Thus we read in holy Scripture that man's freedom of choice is the occasion of his merit:

"He that could have transgressed, and hath not transgressed, and could do evil things and hath not done them, therefore are his goods estab-